

Question 20 - Development in protected landscapes

Paragraphs 10.3 & 10.4 of the Issues and Options report sets out the importance of protecting our protected landscapes and the potential limitations this may place on how much and where development should be placed. Question 20 sought views on the levels of restriction that would be favoured.

Option 1 - Place significant restrictions on development

Option 2 - Allow for development to meet local needs

Option 3 - Allow for greater levels of development

Option 4 - None of the above or an alternative

Those that made comment said.

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
FS-Case-297933432	Harry Carter	option3	As it stands it is not possible to build on land that is open countryside outside the BUAB. The BUAB is an arbitrary line which does not take account of any local features, history, etc of a site and is therefore overly restrictive to the point that a large number of potential windfall sites are overlooked. There are thousands of these sites throughout the country which if developed would go a considerable way the solving our housing shortage.
FS-Case-297949549	Martin Thurgood	option1	East Devon has clearly defined growth points at Cranbrook and at the extremities of the City of Exeter. These provide the essential opportunities for development that secure the continuing environmental protection for the remainder of East Devon's cherished landscapes.
FS-Case-299861217	Heath Nickels Exmouth Wildlife Group	option4	<p>This question goes back to a fundamental INITIAL policy decision for this Local Plan (i.e) using the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) to define the Future Housing Needs (Obj. 3) and thus developing a spatial strategy: Distribution of development (Chap. 13)</p> <p>Tackling this decision determines WHERE and HOW development is going to be allowed and therefore impinges directly on Options 1-3 in this question (Question 20)</p> <p>Once the distribution of development has been established the DESIGN policies for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health and Well being Tackling the Climate Emergency Natural Environment Sustainable Transport Beautiful and Healthy spaces and buildings Town Centres Connections and Infrastructure Built Heritage <p>can be established to serve the development distribution.</p>
FS-Case-300714787	Blank - No Name	option2	Heritage is vital as you point out for health and mental well being. Devon has a rich cultural past and needs to keep and develop it for the future generations. It should not be squandered for the sake of mammon.
FS-Case-300872971	Ian Wasson	option1	East Devon is very large, I'm sure many sites will be put forward for development in area's that are perhaps less attractive and are not in the AONB. This is a very important policy, if we want to keep East Devon beautiful and not ruin it, as in for example the case of Exeter.
FS-Case-301424628	ERIC BOWMAN	option1	THIS WOULD OBVIOUSLY VERY EXPENSIVE TO ATTACHIEVE BUT CLEVER DESIGN WOULD HELP TO MAKE SOMETHING THAT TOTALLY COMPLIENTS THE ENVIRNOMENT
FS-Case-302640746	Hazel Jeffery	option2	Currently we have development that does not meet local needs and adds extra pressure on infrastructure, schools etc. However it is not just development, there are plenty of 'junk' areas in the East devon country side

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
			that could be cleaned up, and the level of haze could be reduced in the air by stopping all sorts of burning of waste.
FS-Case-302912562	Paul Gamble	option3	New housing that supports zero carbon, increased biodiversity and is of high quality design should be allowed. Spreading larger numbers of small developments across the whole of East Devon will reduce the pressure for big new infrastructure requirements. There are many small/medium sized villages across all of East Devon that can each easily accommodate a small number of new homes. This approach will also importantly help to maintain/increase their vitality and make sure that valuable local services are not lost because they are not being used. Priority could be given to villages that have access to public transport within the suggested approx 800m comfortable walking distance, which has routes to larger towns and cities to access larger facilities and services.
FS-Case-302971165	Richard Thurlow Sid Vale Association	option1	Amalgamate West Dorset and EDDC AONB's etc to form new National Park in the existing Jurassic Coast UNESCO World Heritage site
FS-Case-303403737	Mr&Mrs Wood	option1	We should be protecting all natural environments and promoting and making room for more connection throughout the natural world.
FS-Case-304854668	John Catchpole None	option2	Before any approval for development of a site within AONB an Environmental Impact Statement/Assessment needs to be carried out to ensure all environmental issues are addressed.
FS-Case-305714384	Miles Butler	option4	In reality it is very difficult to know in East Devon where the boundaries of protected landscapes end. Much of East Devon is of high landscape value even if not designated AONB. There should be a more sophisticated test of whether an area should be open to development or protected from it.
FS-Case-306237729	Geoff Crawford	option1	There has been and is planned to be FAR to much development on green sites in EDDC
FS-Case-306256851	Simon Rennie		no comment see objective 10 section 12 questions
FS-Case-306308166	Sylvia Meller	option1	No new building in green areas, full stop! As mentioned before, there is enough space that can be re-developed , build on top of existing structures. We do need more protected landscapes!
FS-Case-306915743	Catherine Kingham	option1	The AONBs, Pebblebed Heathland, Exe Estuary, River Otter and Estuary, Blackdown Hills, Jurassic Coast and the like, should all be left entirely free from development. If development is to take place in East Devon it should be around areas such as new towns (Cranbrook), and existing Cities/large towns (Exeter, Honiton). It is VITAL for everyone that the large open spaces be protected totally - during this Covid-19 pandemic, people have used the open spaces to keep themselves sane and to help prevent mental health issues. Once developed, these green rural beautiful areas will be gone forever. Wildlife also thrive in such places and with wildlife comes sanity for all.
FS-Case-307126895	Daren Richards	option3	Development is needed
FS-Case-307313176	Jonne Ceserani	option2	I think the key issue here is to watch for setting precedents and allowing creeping design so that over time unintended change arises. It is important to have a policy that takes the big view first to establish a vision and then decision can be made within that always keeping an eye on that vision.
FS-Case-307693356	Michael Horn	option1	Policy E7 of the current Local Plan is a developers charter as it is self-sustaining and allows unrestricted and unstoppable development in the open countryside.
FS-Case-307991316	Susan Cooper	option1	No allocated development in villages in AONB (exclude from 'larger' village settlement category). Restrict to affordable housing (policy similar to Strategy 35). This to avoid damage to the character/landscape. Consistent with the NPPF where the emphasis is on developing outside a designated area unless there are no alternative options. There are other options that could be pursued.

50 dwellings large scale definition arbitrary i.e.15 dwellings would be large

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
			scale in a small village of less than 500 dwellings. The NPPF (para 172, 173) states large scale depends on sites nature, scale and setting. A better criteria would be to say this is dependent on the landscape and biodiversity context but should be no more than 5% of a village's current level of houses .
			Other protected areas:-Local green spaces (in NP), statutory/non-statutory ecological areas, green gaps including gardens to protect habitats and views, high grade agricultural land, flood areas, conservation areas.
FS-Case-308046000	Elizabeth Freemantle	option3	Build in a few larger areas more houses rather than putting them everywhere. Better infrastructure can be put in etc.
FS-Case-308046720	Jonathan Page	option1	But allow single quality design and innovation led projects which can enhance the land by regenerative design
FS-Case-308046866	Simon Greenslade	option1	Landscapes are protected for a reason
FS-Case-308049835	Peter Duncan	option1	Green belt and AONB important to retain. In filling for profit rather by developers requires maximum control as to real worth.
FS-Case-308062599	Susan Tyrrell	option2	This is where neighbourhood plans and consultation with parish councils must be taken into account and acted upon.
FS-Case-308071816	Gillian Cameron-Webb n/r	option2	Option 2 on condition that any development is at least 60% affordable housing. Regardless of whether the developer is promising housing or infrastructure to fulfill a local need, they must be compelled to build it first otherwise they will just build their houses and then claim viability issues to drop the promised local need. E.g. in Newton Poppleford King Alfred Way, developers used local need to justify a development outside the BUAB and in the AONB and got a reduction of affordable housing from 60% to 30% for promising to build a doctor's surgery. However they then then claimed viability issues and dropped the doctor's surgery. Developers mustn't be trusted, ever. As I understand it, developers also failed to build the promised infrastructure in Cranbrook.
FS-Case-308072238	Robert Cooper	option2	Some planning applications are rejected as it is in an ANOB. This is often used in an inappropriate manner when the proposals would make little difference. We live in a progressive age so we have to allow things to grow and develop. T
FS-Case-308168070	Norman Reeder	option2	This approach should be aligned with that documented earlier regarding promotion of self-build and small developments
FS-Case-308171880	Colin Rivett	option1	If these landscapes are already "protected", then they ought to stay protected.
FS-Case-308177703	Judith Ferrier	option4	Why is all this "development" really needed?
FS-Case-308256653	Della Cannings	option1	It seems you've already lost the plot as many examples of inappropriate rural development
FS-Case-308288718	Emily Davis	option1	Absolutely restrict it - for now. Right now we have more people than facilities. We have to take stock and re-look at how we're building. A lack of parking spaces is a huge problem in small towns. Adding more housing doesn't solve that and, until we do, we need to reduce the amount of housebuilding until that can be solved.
			Better public transport to certain areas would help. For example, we now have no town bus in Ottery so the oldies living out in the estates can't use the shops in town without Ottery Help Scheme. This is ridiculous. The bus from Ottery to Sidmouth (via all the villages) used to run every hour. Now its every two, so to go for a half hour swimming session with the kids could take 4-5 hours around the buses.
			More affordable buses - less car needed. Less cars = safer roads = more cyclists/walkers.
FS-Case-308324058	Jack Slim	option2	Very small developments for technical firms in advanced ecologically based buildings blending with or even integrating into the landscape - showcase

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
			stuff. We have to be aware that practicalities will rule that small developments in protected landscapes will be reached by private car - so there will be car park provision.
FS-Case-308326362	Peter Eastwood N/A	option1	Vital !
FS-Case-308406499	Alan Franklin	option2	The need for additional housing in some rural areas would be reduced if there were constraints on second home ownership.
FS-Case-308410804	David Forward Domestic	option2	A protected landscape should be protected not nibbled away.
FS-Case-308546698	Noel Allan	option2	Keep our towns and villages separated, do not allow them to be swallowed up. eg Protecting the 'green triangle' between Seaton and Colyford, which has been and is under constant threat from development. Locals don't want it developed and that should be the ruling priority.
FS-Case-308618646	Christopher Eccles	option3	its all down to quality
FS-Case-308638086	Robin Barker	option4	The 3 options are too woolly and unimaginative. We need to make better use of what we have. We need restrictions as well as appropriate development
FS-Case-308655667	Jan Gannaway Exmouth Wildlife Group + Active Travel Exmouth	option2	Some small scale local development, if carefully chosen, could enhance communities and reduce the need for travel to work.
FS-Case-308801635	L Martin	option3	Protect the environment at the same time as protecting people in their communities...it goes hand in hand
FS-Case-308816947	Heather Elgar Woodland Trust	option1	Protected landscapes in East Devon are designated for their ecological significance, and it is important that development is restricted to allow nature to be protected and recover in these important areas. Beyond protected landscapes, it is crucial that development that would adversely affect, directly or indirectly, any ecologically valuable site and irreplaceable habitat, is not permitted. Protection should also extend to the integrity of ecological networks which support this important ecology.
FS-Case-308861482	Sophie Cook	option2	Our roads cannot take anymore level of traffic..
FS-Case-308895922	Diana Wynn	option2	Protecting our rural landscapes is important, but is tied in with answers I have given previously.
FS-Case-308930499	Lisa Bowman Exmouth Town Council	option2	Members felt that villages should be allowed to develop to sustain their viability and retain their amenities, such as pubs and shops. Development needs to be appropriate and meet local needs but how do you define local needs? Members do not feel that second homes satisfy local needs - nor does a predominance of larger family homes to the exclusion of affordable/social housing.
FS-Case-308948443	Karin Goodfellow	option1	It is important that brown sites are redeveloped before any building on green sites, particularly in ANOB areas. Developers tend to prefer green sites as they are cheaper to develop than covering brown sites.
FS-Case-309114723	Robert Anthony	option2	Be inventive!
FS-Case-309131539	Daniel Bristowe	option2	Allow local self-builders to build one-off homes rather than huge developers monopolising areas.
FS-Case-309142890	Camilla Mathison	option2	Protected areas are protected for good reason allowing them to be developed anyway makes their protection worthless!
FS-Case-309254127	J Nickels	option4	Once the distribution of development has been established the DESIGN policies for Health and Well being Tackling the Climate Emergency Natural Environment Sustainable Transport Beautiful and Healthy spaces and buildings

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
			Town Centres Connections and Infrastructure Built Heritage
			can be established to serve the development distribution.
FS-Case-309293778	Paul Smith	option2	The provision of local affordable/social housing should be a priority for EDDC. This is clearly not a priority for volume house builders who will plead viability issues, including the demands of statutory 106 agreements and CIL payments, as excuses for minimal provision, or failure to provide infrastructure unless planning permission is granted upon great swaths of Greenfield land. This must be vigorously challenged! Additionally a District wide review of land suitable for development should seek to confirm from small Town and Village communities,(particularly those with Neighbourhood Plans), areas of localised need, where small scale dwelling construction would be beneficial. This may entail a relaxation of the Villages Plan where development would otherwise be excluded due to build up boundary restrictions. A similar approach must be pursued in respect of the 66% of AONB, where localised affordable and social housing needs exist and should contribute to the District quota .
FS-Case-309383731	Val Ranger	option1	Protecting the environment is essential. Upholding recently produced Neighbourhood Plans are essential, they must not be undermined by new changes in the Local Plan
FS-Case-309385676	Roger Pell	option3	nimby ism should not be a valid reason for complaint or resistance to change
FS-Case-309401093	Philip Jordan	option2	I believe the combination of encouraging business to spread over the area and small, more personable, building developments is the way forward. The GESP thoughts on tens of thousands of houses in one concentrated area will be a disaster as we have seen over the whole of the UK, and Cranberry a perfect example of how not to do it.
FS-Case-309425268	Pamela Dean	option4	More low cost housing for local people only.
FS-Case-309456508	Ian Birch	option2	The council's approach on this should default to what is in a relevant Neighbourhood Plan. Listen to the locals! If there's no NP, then default to what's applicable for the Conservation Area or AONB.
FS-Case-309465143	Daisy mclauchlan	option3	Of course we should build everywhere, people don't only live in the West end. Where do we think that our growing families are going to live? PLEASE BUILD ALL OVER EAST DEVON, SMALL DEVELOPMENTS OF AFFORDABLE AND SOCIAL HOUSING.
FS-Case-309478869	Rosemary Birch	option2	Creating (allowing) developments because they have included a scheme for 'mitigation' may sometimes result in something being built that seems entirely inappropriate either destroying the green space it is built on, or just being an eye sore in that particular context. It is allowed perhaps because they will put some hedges in, or plant a few trees somewhere, but there is still a development, hard buildings that are there. That seems wrong. Landscapes are protected for a reason.
FS-Case-309583339	Andy Bourne	option4	An AONB should be exactly that but shouldn't necessarily prevent appropriate and sympathetic development. Each case must be extremely carefully considered and involve the local community.
FS-Case-309588076	Carol Jay Transition Exmouth	option1	We have lost the vast majority of our protected landscape and what remains is a vital reservoir for wildlife, as well as irreplaceable amenity for humans. Planning should not only protect what is left but impose a net biodiversity gain on all development elsewhere (eg wildlife corridors , bat boxes, swift boxes, hedgehog highways, flowers beneficial to pollinators) DESIGN policies for Health and Well being Tackling the Climate Emergency Natural Environment Sustainable Transport Beautiful and Healthy spaces and buildings

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
			Town Centres Connections and Infrastructure Built Heritage should be established to assess the development distribution.
FS-Case-309879551	David Goodfellow	option1	Much more use could be made of re-use of land (such as brown field and re-development/regeneration of poor areas) before protected landscapes, Green belts, and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty need be taken.
FS-Case-310194190	WAYNE SUMMERS	option3	Your approach is all wrong! you consult then decide a certain area/field is the ONLY place you can build which then means its worth a fortune the land owner gets greedy as does the developer and you end up with an expensive awful housing estate none of which helps the locals! If you got local communities to organise and build for their locals it could be truly affordable to keep locals local and the villages thriving
FS-Case-310456969	Penny Kurowski	option1	I probably favour somewhere between Option 1 and 2. Local needs would have to be strong to allow for development in protected landscapes. The planning controls around any development would need to be strict and closely monitored.
FS-Case-310579594	Richard Lawrence	option2	We need to maintain green areas. Fields are what people come to Devon to see not vast Housing Estates
FS-Case-310604804	Sarah Alana Sayers Farringdon Parish Council	option2	Farringdon has an aging population. Policy Farr 5 permits development to meet local needs as identified in the housing survey July 2019. The need is likely to continue as long as local households wish to remain in the Farringdon area. For this reason policy Farr 5 supports where appropriate , the development of a single dwelling on a current residential plot, thereby enabling existing households to downsize to more suitable housing and free up one family house per new dwelling.
FS-Case-310651264	Derek Wensley East Budleigh with Bicton Parish Council	option1	East Budleigh with Bicton Parish Council wishes to ensure that the AONB landscape and biodiversity are protected.
FS-Case-310675340	Bec Davey Axmouth Parish Council	option1	Axmouth is within an AONB and as such must be protected
FS-Case-311676977	Rosalind Fox	option2	This would appear to offer a reasonable balance where local needs could be met.
FS-Case-311693209	Jeremy Woodward Vision Group for Sidmouth	option2	Designation of the ED AONB as a National Park would afford these landscapes greater protection, but might be too restrictive: https://tinyurl.com/trsjz3fj The Sid Valley NP allows for development beyond the BUAB – but only if it meets local needs; also, AONB landscapes are protected, with ‘great importance’ placed on the Sidford and Sidbury gap, for example: https://tinyurl.com/26jyeuf9 Nevertheless, the industrial estate at Sidford has been allowed, despite being rejected at planning as it impacted protected landscape: https://tinyurl.com/867dwtuv And yet an application for a solar farm in Sidbury was rejected because “it has not been demonstrated that development in the highly protected AONB landscape is essential”: https://tinyurl.com/3eyyy3yb Difficult choices will have to be made.
FS-Case-311868155	Martin Dowse	option1	The real problem is government policy which is allowing willy nilly development and a free for all charter to developers on the fast buck gravy train
FS-Case-312184112	Linda Lowes N/A	option1	It is essential that the AONB are protected, once it has gone you will never get it back.
FS-Case-312251067	Neal Jillings Place Land Ltd	option3	I am not a fan of the binary argument that is imposed on development proposals. A development is not either 'sustainable' or 'unsustainable'. A housing development within an AONB is not necessarily bad in LVIA terms whereas a site outside the AONB is acceptable in LVIA terms. Who are we planning for? if there is a need in the AONB, for instance, the LPA should attempt to meet it where it arises. The means of addressing this without

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
			resorting to lazy binary decision making is to assess each proposal on its merits and seek appropriate design and mitigation commensurate with the location and the scope and scale of the proposal. Planners are trained to deal with a variety of competing matters in arriving at decisions. The Local Plan should not be too limiting in this regard.
FS-Case-312255566	Stephen sadler	option4	At some point if all the housing WANTS are to be met then the countryside will have to be sacrificed. The question is how and when. There is no point just nibbling into the countryside with each new development on the edge of each town. Cranbrook was supposed to be a new town that prevented unsuitable development in the existing towns but this has proven to be a hollow promise. Therefore maybe EDDC needs to be bold and declare Cranbrook will double in size (it can cater for this with improved infrastructure, more schools and more shops, and already has a railway station and buses into Exeter and can have job opportunities built there). This can be supported with the development of another new town probably near to M5 between Cranbrook and Cullompton.
FS-Case-312449388	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option2	Our client supports the protection and enhancement of East Devon's outstanding natural environment. Option 2 is therefore selected to allow villages within a landscape designation to provide limited development to meet local needs. Sustainable villages outside of any landscape designation should be allowed to grow to help meet the wider needs of the district.
FS-Case-312482944	Peter Bowler NA	option1	Not just "significant", but absolute restrictions.
FS-Case-312560519	Catherine Pester	option4	The land is protected for a reason - leave the protected land as it is
FS-Case-312655834	Theresa Sanders	option2	in 10.3 AONB it states that in local communities 'there is scope for small scale developments I hope there are clear fixed guidelines for what this constitutes and is not open to interpretation
FS-Case-312726461	Anthony Bevan N/A	option1	We need to stop the creep of development in the AONB's.
FS-Case-312744056	Christina Skinner	option2	Do not lose greenfield sites or agriculture land as you will never get these back. Look at other alternatives first.
FS-Case-312753468	Rosalind Buxton Luppitt Parish Council	option2	It is essential to protect these landscapes as they act as a particular attraction to tourists, visitors and residents.
FS-Case-312781179	Carine Silver	option1	Restrictions on development does not need to stymie all changes if done sympathetically. I would like to see the AONBs developed as true active holiday destinations (wildlife visitor centres, local food vegan cafes, network of cycle tracks, sympathetic holiday parks). But huge warehouses, sprawling 'business' parks, and poor agricultural developments (eg intensive or inappropriate farming) should be severely restricted.
FS-Case-312788353	Rosemary Walker	option3	AONB is desirable but unfortunately at times it means that high density housing becomes the norm. In places the AONB is similar to a wall surrounding a medieval town so all the new building has to be done in a confined space.
FS-Case-312834131	Robert Dunn	option1	Certainly building new towns and villages in the ANOBs would be detrimental. Infill development in existing villages and towns in the ANOB should be supported and encouraged. Extra pressure on the transport infrastructure should also be kept in mind in terms of development in protected landscapes, which often have less capacity to cope with extra journeys.
FS-Case-313070314	Kevin Finch Whimple Parish Council	option2	we need to maintain green areas. Fields are what people come to Devon to see not vast Housing estates
FS-Case-313155665	Catherine Dandridge	option2	There is local needs to meet but not at the absolute cost to wildlife/natural habitat. If AONB are not protected what is here for tourists to visit & enjoy thus destroying one of East Devon's main industries.
FS-Case-313233811	Phil Golder	option1	Any new development should be restricted to self-build eco-homes. Policy should concentrate on freeing up empty properties, including prohibitive

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
			taxing of empty second homes and significant taxes on entities owning multiple rental properties (which could be used for affordable housing)
FS-Case-313343575	Joanna Burkey	option4	I think that development should not be allowed at all on protected landscapes, they are called protected for a reason. Protected from being built on. If developments are allowed in these areas then going forward this status means nothing.
FS-Case-313428092	John Cooper	option1	No allocated development in villages in AONB (exclude from 'larger' village settlement category). Restrict to affordable housing (policy similar to Strategy 35). This to avoid damage to the character/landscape. Consistent with the NPPF where the emphasis is on developing outside a designated area unless there are no alternative options. There are other options that could be pursued.
			Other protected areas:-Local green spaces
FS-Case-313459444	Mike Allen EDDC	option2	AONB should be protected from most forms of manufacturing and large-scale developments. We should allow re-use of derelict buildings even if the existing structures would need complete replacement. small scale development to sustain villages should be allowed within the bounds of the Neighbourhood Plan policies
FS-Case-313523282	Gary Barlow	option3	Stop playing nanny state, there are lots of places in east devon that can be developed but the planners sit on their hands too scared to look at themselves in a mirror.
FS-Case-313523797	Heather Broadbent	option1	It seems East Devon ignores this policy
FS-Case-313542858	Judith Heathcock	option1	Bio-diversity is essential.
FS-Case-313584761	Richard Norman Musbury Barn	option3	ED Planning far too often sit upon AofONB; it may be so however it should not prevent as it does large doses of common sense.
FS-Case-313603740	Eileen Beech	option2	Wherever people live they must have access to countryside and natural world.
FS-Case-313613307	Madeleine Blu	option4	Protected landscapes must be protected.
FS-Case-313643991	Douglas Smith	option1	We need to protect our landscape
FS-Case-313672954	Brian Ward	option1	Trees in Conservation need to be protected. In Budleigh Salterton we have lost many trees in conservation areas to housing.
FS-Case-313678330	june glennie	option1	plenty of beautiful spaces outside the usual honeyspots
FS-Case-313693362	Gary Tubb	option2	Live - work use of redundant buildings, enhance the local area and create much needed employment, both for the developer and their successors.
FS-Case-313694058	Joseph Williams	option2	The quality of development is especially important in these areas. Ensuring development is sensitive and appropriate to the local area could make it better-received by existing residents and visitors
FS-Case-313710620	Jacqueline Cox	option3	small development where appropriate is preferable to large scale development.
FS-Case-313718525	Robert Maynard	option1	Option 1 a) In designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty the conservation and enhancement of their natural beauty should be given priority over other considerations, Development should only be for where it would support their conservation and enhancement or would foster their social and economic well-being provide that such development is comparable with their conservation. b) Within the Coast Preservation Area, development other than that of a minor nature, will not be provided for except where it is required for the benefit the community at large, in connection with public access for informal

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
			recreation or for the purposes of agriculture or forestry and only when such development cannot reasonably be accommodated outside the protected areas. Such development will only be provided for when it would not detract from the from the unspoilt character and appearance of the coastal area.
FS-Case-313771026	John Connolly	option2	To me this means development that is promoted and sponsored democratically by the resident local community not proposed by an outside developer.
FS-Case-313780058	Megan Lowe	option2	I'm somewhere between option 1 and 2. I think there should be tight restrictions but development should be considered where there is a local need and where the development would not be impacting on biodiversity.
FS-Case-313780822	Jim Stacey	option1	More protection for outstanding views would be welcome. At present, screening seems to be the answer to every misplaced and/or oversized barn or stable.
FS-Case-313857211	Linda Johnson	option3	This option is selected to redress the balance of development being mainly in or near the very large centres in East Devon to the detriment of smaller communities
FS-Case-313997024	Richard Holman	option3	Each application needs to be addressed separately and fairly.
FS-Case-313999789	Jayne Blackmore	option4	There needs to be a wider test of appropriateness for development or protection than the just the fact that there is a green empty space and so develop there!
FS-Case-314090147	Rob Longhurst	option2	Local development for local 365 day residents (locals?) Outstanding landscapes + heritage + beaches = TOURISM
FS-Case-314113114	Caroline Wilson Chardstock Parish Council	option1	AONBs must receive full protection from development. Paragraph 10.4 states that development 'can' result in unacceptable negative impacts on areas of wildlife value; however, large-scale development affects all wildlife.
FS-Case-314133727	Ian Jewson Walsingham Planning Ltd	option4	The new plan should generally protect those areas of most value such as the AONB and focus development in less sensitive locations.
FS-Case-314278250	Keith Bungay	option2	the people of Exmouth put protection of the natural environment as their top priority during the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan
FS-Case-314282919	Norah Jagers Beer Village Heritage, AONB Ambassador, JCT Ambassador	option1	The coast is part of a World Heritage Site and as such brings considerable income to the area. Any development on the coast potentially threatens that status and should be considered very carefully in light of possible de-inscription. Similarly a large portion of East Devon is a protected landscape, and that should be cherished.
FS-Case-314345492	Martyn Smith Feniton Parish Council	option4	The difference in landscape value between the designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and much of the remainder of East Devon is often not great. There needs to be a wider test of appropriateness for development (or protection) than the bald fact of a designation
FS-Case-314437283	Jacqui Baldwin	option2	Option 2 - acceptable as long as it has the support of the local community
FS-Case-314526176	Terry Sneller Dorset Council		Although national policy limits major development in protected landscapes other than in exceptional circumstances, development at an appropriate scale can help to meet local needs and should therefore not be ruled out. As such Option 2 would appear to be the most appropriate enabling local needs to be met whilst minimising impact on the protected landscapes. This is particularly important in the east of the area where opportunities to meet local need would be severely limited if a more restrictive approach was taken.
FS-Case-314536685	Andrew Butler National Farmers Union	option2	It is important to recognize our protected landscapes are not museums but working landscapes and the requirements of the businesses that operate in these areas change over time. They must be allowed to adapt and invest in order to remain competitive, if they are not allowed to the landscape will change putting at risk what is trying to be protected in the first place.
FS-Case-314585169	Peter Faithfull	option2	Rural communities need to grow to remain viable communities.

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
FS-Case-314735839	Heloise Marlow Honiton Town Council	option1	Review and hopefully extend area of AONB Boundaries.
FS-Case-314758581	Peter Ball Kilmington Parish Council	option2	Consult respect and follow Neighbourhood Plans as local PCs better understand local needs and what is relevant to their areas.
FS-Case-314771914	Ian Cherry	option1	There should be very tight constraints on development anywhere when development would mean the loss of rural amenity value. Once spoilt an area may never recover.
FS-Case-314782794	Nicola Daniel	option2	Ideally the AONBs should have the same protection as National Parks. The Glover Review suggests the ED AONB should be incorporated into a NP. If this were the case the NP would be the planning authority for the Park and local, social, housing and economic needs would be addressed. This is the solution for the villages. The worry is the overdevelopment pressure in the rest of the district. Councillors and Planning Officers should be making a very strong case to Central Government that 2/3rds of the district is covered by AONBs and development numbers be reduced.
FS-Case-314832307	Anthony Carthy James Carthy and Company Limited	option2	I believe that the AONB should be adjusted so that it excludes the built area of identified settlements. If there are special areas within them then those should be covered by Conservation Areas.
FS-Case-314894688	John Colby	option2	For Exmouth Option 2 should rely on infilling. Any exceptions would need detailed and specific justification. Environmental designations eg AONB should be protected Limited employment development might be considered an exception
FS-Case-314921504	robert wiltshire	option1	Building in green belts as has become the practice is the first step to a concrete jungle.
FS-Case-314926201	Richard Crabtree	option2	EDDC Planning Committee has allowed too much development in AONBs.
FS-Case-314937410	Eleonore Pang	option1	Keep development to Cranbrook and Exeter but be very aware of over ! developing (infrastructure/health services etc\)
FS-Case-314943918	Des Senior	option2	One of Devon's greatest strengths is its countryside, this should be guarded as far as possible.
FS-Case-314963509	Trudi Franklin	option3	As long as sympathetic with landscape feel that should be able to build in these areas , as sometimes it feels there is one rule for one project and as a different rule for someone else
FS-Case-315078619	David Venner	option4	A common sense approach could allow for a combination of Options 1 & 2. E.g. A local town council identify a need and, in corporation with EDCB, agree on a plot of land, the size and type of accommodation needed and any changes to local infrastructure that would be required to facilitate this. This would ensure that tight restrictions could be retained while ensuring local needs were met ere identified by local councils - Working Together.
FS-Case-315100989	Elaine Wade	option1	I can only comment on the town I live in and which may be similar to other large towns in ED and that is: more development does not just bring pressure on open spaces from more people moving to the area, it encourages those who do not have it to visit. During Covid this has led to parking issues, anti social behaviour issues, more litter and general deterioration of some areas. Before I agreed to option 2 I would want to know what smaller scale meant to EDDC.
FS-Case-315126013	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option2	Our client supports the protection and enhancement of East Devon's outstanding natural environment. Option 2 is therefore selected to allow villages within a landscape designation to provide limited development to meet local needs. Sustainable villages outside of any landscape designation should be allowed to grow to help meet the wider needs of the district.
FS-Case-315136864	Jill Butler	option4	The difference between AONB areas and the rest of East Devon is often indistinguishable. There should be a wider and more sophisticated means of assessing whether an area should be protected from development or not.
FS-Case-315148483	Sara Arthur	option2	Option 2 should take note of objectives outline in local Neighbourhood plans.

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
FS-Case-315168747	Liz Shortland	option2	Use derelict and brown field sites. No second homes. Utilise empty properties. Let's not desecrate any more of our green fields. We don't have the necessary transport structure
FS-Case-315184341	Richard Pratt	option1	Our AONBs play a vital part in attracting visitors to the region and to the well being of residents. They are not just pretty to look at but provide habitat for a wealth of wildlife and ecosystems. If developed, they are lost forever. They should be given the protection they deserve in accordance with NPPF guidelines.
FS-Case-315216760	Elizabeth Campbell	option1	We need to do as much as possible to protect our beautiful landscape from being lost to development. While this may shift emphasis to other areas we should be looking in those areas to redevelop old sites within towns, brownfield sites and not always looking to cover more land on the outskirts of towns.
FS-Case-315262947	Sam Scriven Jurassic Coast Trust	option4	the questions above are at odds with the statement about the value of East Devon's natural environment, in terms of wellbeing, the economy and biodiversity. the wording here frames the environment as a constraint to be adhered to or compromised. It would be preferable for the plan to talk about suitable and sustainable development that seeks to enhance the environment and biodiversity.
FS-Case-315275424	Rob Phillips Broadhembury Neighbourhood Community Land Trust (BNCLT)	option1	The natural environmental and rural aspects of East Devon are its heritage. It is the protection of these landscapes, as you state in para 10.3 and 10.4, that will enable the true opportunities for economic growth, and the wellbeing of the local communities to occur.
FS-Case-315287680	Jennifer Hiley-Payne N/A	option2	Relevance to local requirements should be considered
FS-Case-315449037	Darren Roberts East Devon District Council, Central Planning	option2	It is inevitable that unless all growth is to occur in the West End that development in the protected landscapes will occur. It is inappropriate to expect the housing needs of Sidmouth, Honiton or Budleigh Salterton to be met by development in the West End
FS-Case-315455012	Rachel Hughes	option1	Development pressure elsewhere in East Devon can be managed. Once protected landscapes are developed, they are lost.
FS-Case-315476876	Graham Long Upottery Parish Council	option2	As a parish within the Blackdown Hills AONB, AONB and National Park designation must not be used as an excuse for stagnation. For communities to thrive they must be allowed to grow in terms of housing and community and economic needs. Equally though it would be wrong to impose blanket restrictions on growth and the new plan must allow all development in protected landscapes to be considered on its merit with the voice of the local community having the final say.
FS-Case-315516791	Mary Truell None	option4	Stop this horrendous passion for so-called 'development'. There won't be a blade of grass left in Devon if we go on like this. It is lunacy. Let Nature do the developing, only then will our biggest asset be nurtured and come again. Are we blind or stupid? Thousands have seen for years that a pandemic would come which would shake us into the reawakening of our common sense. Covid has come. Have many families now suffered and died for nothing? This opportunity for change for the better must be seized now and you have the power to do it.
FS-Case-315539551	Gary Parsons Sport England		no comment
FS-Case-315622017	Robert Martin Clyst Honiton Parish Council	option2	There are occasional needs for developing in protected landscapes, where local consensus is gained. These should only be based on an absolute need for such development.

The concept of allowing other development on such protected sites is ludicrous and should not increase pressure for development elsewhere. This is because such major development should not be considered in the first place.

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
			In the district, the effect of large-scale development creates areas which are in stark contrast to other areas in terms of landscape. A mix of Option 2 and 3 will encourage growth in a greater range of landscapes and will not polarise areas in the District.
FS-Case-315666051	Olly Davey	option2	Alongside local consultation.
FS-Case-315672889	James Dorey Plainview Planning	option2	<p>We would suggest that a proportionate approach is adopted to allow a suitable amount of growth across the Borough including within existing small built clusters and would allow suitable plots from coming forward in the future.</p> <p>The NPPF highlights that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly.</p> <p>Policies should allow for additional windfall sites to come forward which are evenly distributed across the Borough.</p>
FS-Case-315678300	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option4	Our client supports option 4 as the other three options represent an over-simplification of landscape sensitivities. Strategic employment and/or housing allocations are most likely to be preferable in planning terms outside of any landscape designations, for example on the edge of Exeter. Smaller scale developments may be acceptable elsewhere depending on their location, scale, benefits and context.
FS-Case-315681467	Jacqui Best	option2	<p>However allow some sensitive expansion of the main towns into sites within the AONB</p> <p>Areas of great landscape value outside AONBs, also treat sensitively.</p>
FS-Case-315685113	Lauren James MMO	option2	It is very important to conserve protected areas, but it is essential to avoid putting lots of strain on other areas as well.
FS-Case-315690761	Naome Glanville	option1	If you allow building in protected landscapes, developers will also build in other settings too. Protect what you can.
FS-Case-315804855	Sophie Minter	option1	We have to be vigilantly protective of the AONBs and Coastal Heritage site at the absolute minimum! These landscapes and their importance for the natural world is under massive threat and everything must be done to protect them, not only for nature but for our own health and wellbeing.
FS-Case-315884481	stephen moore Mr	option1	Protection of our East Devon landscapes is essential as we move forward into a ever more crowded world. And that's not just for Sidmouth but for the distant parts of East Devon as well.
FS-Case-315892586	Carolyn Bowles	option1	If the landscape is protected why are you building on it? Dont', that's the whole point of protecting it.
FS-Case-315937332	Fiona Anderson	option1	Protection is always being nibbled away at the edges, enough already!
FS-Case-315939416	linda aucott	option2	AONB's cannot be no go areas. Well planned development in keeping with the area - particularly affordable housing should be prioritised and contribute to housing provision. Communities must remain diverse and not become exclusive.
FS-Case-315947650	Rosalind Rapley	option1	Ottery has already become overdeveloped despite the neighbourhood plan. The area must be protected and only appropriate development approved. People must come before profit.
FS-Case-315961800	David & Mrs Wendy Lewis	option2	We don't think we should encourage offsetting to justify destruction of important wildlife habitats.
FS-Case-315967632	David Daniel	option2	The current guidance and policies adopted in our National Parks should set the context. The Glover Review made a strong recommendation for the East Devon AONB to be incorporated into a new National Park
FS-Case-315984133	Daphne CURRIER	option1	Once its gone- its gone. I have outlined other ideas previously about using empty properties e.t.c. Where there's a will there's a way. More development pressure elsewhere is inevitable.
FS-Case-316012231	Terry Sweeney	option1	This applies to development outside Local dev Boundaries, which you did not explain in your question. Within development boundaries, of course some

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
			development for local need should be, and is, allowed if appropriate. In the Uplyme NP we have identified affordable housing sites adjoining the boundary, but would wish to see tight control over development in open countryside , all AONB. Care with wording please!
			Our Protected Landscapes are EDs most precious assets, and I do not wish them to be less well protected.
FS-Case-316023654	lauren allan	option1	I do think AONB take priority and we have to make the other areas work harder. It should not mean they can't also be beautiful. There are already poly tunnels in AONB, and given the science that they have 4.5 times less mean environmental impact than other systems, we may need to see more elsewhere (Agronomy Sustainable Development 2011).
FS-Case-316034840	Nicola Baker	option4	There are areas in East Devon that are not classed as AONB but are identical to areas that are, so there needs to be a more accurate means of assessing whether an area should be protected from development or not.
FS-Case-316036693	Philip Wragg none	option1	The Local Plan needs to reflect the Government's new Planning White Paper introducing the concept of Zoning which it is intended to protect land in Conservation Areas and the area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
FS-Case-316047097	Richard Pryor	option2	Consider restarting building Council Houses as in the past. Think of the 1960s. This would produce cheaper properties as builders add 20% or more to the market price.
FS-Case-316053199	Ben Evans	option2	But it depends whether we are making best use of the existing properties within the areas where we do have protected landscapes. If these are all full of second homes and holiday homes because they are desirable places for this purpose then this is using up our housing stock and requiring development in other areas of East Devon which is ridiculous and creates a significant divide between these communities. You are going to end up with an East vs West Devon split within the district if you are not careful and balance development out more.
FS-Case-316054109	Martin Sawyer	option1	The East Devon AONB should be extended to include the whole geographic area of the Axe Valley.
FS-Case-316056741	Helene Jessop RSPB		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RSPB recommends an amended Option 1 where significant restrictions are placed on development that impact on nature conservation assets including statutorily designated sites and habitats and species of principal importance, and conflict with or not enable enhancement and restoration of nature. • The RSPB recommends that, in describing the natural environment assets of east Devon (para 10.1), the Plan expands its specific mentions of protected areas from the named AONBs and Jurassic Coast WHA to include the east Devon heathlands (Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation) and Exe Estuary (Special Protection Area and Ramsar site). These are of international/European importance for nature. Sites statutorily designated for their nature conservation value (Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs and Sites of Special Scientific Interest and others including Local Nature Reserves) and others including County Wildlife Sites are all important components of East Devon's natural environment
FS-Case-316057937	irene Wyndham	option1	I thought that within development boundaries of towns and villages we did allow for such development. In open countryside there must be strict control.
FS-Case-316065989	Sarah Butcher	option2	I'd like to point out that although mitigation is more positive than no mitigation at all, it still in no way replaces the habitat lost. I have just spent 9 hrs a day for three days trying to trap and translocate small mammals from a site that is about to be built on near me. The habitat is amazing, and development should never have been allowed here. The mitigation for the loss of foraging for tawny owls, bats, and at least 8 other mammal species observed today (field vole, bank vole, wood mouse, harvest mouse, rabbits, badgers, foxes and deer) not mentioning all the frogs, toads and slowworms,

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
			is to be one small field that already supports it's own population of wildlife. No enhancements can make up for that loss. We're just squeezing wildlife into an ever smaller space in an area that long-term will not be able to support it.
FS-Case-316125851	Diana jennings	option1	Option 1 is vital to protect the area. See our previous point about the need to use brown field sites for development.
FS-Case-316127402	Eleanor Rylance	option2	Even areas of outstanding natural beauty need to accommodate their young people. Of course we should allow for limited development in such areas, maybe with local ties on new dwellings in order to protect the local economy and ensure that people can stay living where they work, or work where they live.
FS-Case-316127687	Lisa Turner Blackdown Hills AONB Partnership	option2	Option 2 best aligns with the NPPF approach for the AONBs. Any policies should reflect the hierarchy and roles of particular designations, i.e. AONBs have the highest level of protection. If there is pressure to accommodate greater levels of development in the AONBs, very clear policy guidance should be given and the potential for compensation for adverse impacts should be explored - policy DEV25 of the Plymouth and SW Devon Joint Local Plan offers an example in this respect.
FS-Case-316135438	George Williams Greensalade Taylor Hunt	option3	Our client supports the protection and enhancement of East Devon's outstanding natural environment. However, for the reasons set out previously in this response, villages within protected landscapes such as AONBs should also be allowed to grow especially when there are sites within and on the edge of villages that could be developed without demonstrable harm to the special qualities of the wider AONB. Our client therefore suggests option 3 and puts forward the site at Down Close, Newton Poppleford for allocation to this end.
FS-Case-316136353	Bill Horner Historic Environment Team, Devon County Council		Protected Landscapes are also of great importance as outstanding historic/cultural landscapes. They are also the settings of many designated and undesignated heritage assets.
FS-Case-316158325	Paul Hayward Personal View only	option2	Sadly, our AONB's are not protected as much as they could be. An urgent detailed consideration of the Glover Review is well overdue.
FS-Case-316159794	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option2	Our client supports the protection and enhancement of East Devon's outstanding natural environment. Option 2 is therefore selected to allow villages within a landscape designation to provide limited development to meet local needs. Sustainable villages outside of any landscape designation should be allowed to grow to help meet the wider needs of the district.
FS-Case-316176196	Adrian Toole	option2	Restrictions should not be used to prohibit applications for renewable energy generation. Such things of course need not have an indefinite life-span.
FS-Case-316181550	Deborah Griffiths Devon Archaeological Society		Consideration of development in protected landscape needs to take particular regard of archaeology, historic buildings, their settings and wider historic landscape character.
FS-Case-316188495	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option2	Our clients support the protection and enhancement of East Devon's outstanding natural environment. Option 2 is therefore selected to allow villages within a landscape designation to provide limited development to meet local needs. Sustainable villages outside of any landscape designation should be allowed to grow to help meet the wider needs of the district.
FS-Case-316240170	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option2	Our clients support the protection and enhancement of East Devon's outstanding natural environment. Option 2 is therefore selected to allow villages within a landscape designation to provide limited development to meet local needs. Sustainable villages outside of any landscape designation should be allowed to grow to help meet the wider needs of the district.
FS-Case-316255332	Matthew Sherwood	option4	The difference in landscape value between the designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and much of the remainder of East Devon is often not great. There needs to be a wider test of appropriateness for development (or protection) than the bald fact of a designation.

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
FS-Case-316371196	Josie Denning	option4	The difference in landscape value between the designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and much of the remainder of East Devon is often not great. There needs to be a wider test of appropriateness for development (or protection) than the bald fact of a designation.
FS-Case-316377163	John Sherwood	option3	Some villages in protected areas are struggling to sustain local services eg schools, which have to be sustained by commuting from more populous areas, (although it is generally accepted that primary children should be able to walk to school wherever possible), the local shop, pub and public transport.
FS-Case-316444654	Eva Ingleson	option4	No development should be allowed on protected landscapes - whats the point of protecting them if you're going to allow detrimental changes to them.
FS-Case-319425252	Peter Simmons	option1	Continue to protect local landscapes
FS-Case-323231602	Gordon Hodgson	option2	As ever the devil is in the detail. Pressure to build on land facing or near to the Exe Estuary, for example, should have very significant restrictions. The underlying pressure for this to be permitted is probably great but should be resisted. So much of East Devon may be considered as an AONB, officially or not, that finding places where development, housing or for the likes of windfarms etc, is difficult.
FS-Case-323661989	Michael Gooch Boyer	option3	Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that plans should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In this regard, strategic development offers greater opportunities for providing strategic, regional levels of new infrastructure, both in terms of socio-economic infrastructure, but also landscape and biodiversity. It is therefore considered that greater consideration of the benefits of larger-scale developments within protected landscapes should be given, while individual development opportunities should always been considered on their individual merits and should not be disregarded due to high-level assessments. An alternative spatial strategy would also lead to an increased need for developments at existing settlements where they may or may not be sufficient infrastructure and could result in significant impacts on local character.
FS-Case-324952647	Lawrence Turner Boyer Planning	option2	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-324964822	Sarah Jackson	option2	This should also apply to those communities directly adjacent to areas of protected landscapes as unfettered growth can have negative consequences to areas close by. To limit growth entirely is unwise as it reduces the sustainability of those communities but it should be sensitive to local need and of the impact on neighbouring residents.
FS-Case-324977684	Simon Collier Collier Planning	option3	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-324988465	Simon Collier Collier Planning	option3	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-324999075	David Morgan Not Applicable	option1	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325010263	Nick Freer David Lock Associates	option4	no comment
FS-Case-325030287	John Withrington N/A	option4	While the designation of AONBs is welcome, it can become a blunt tool. There are many beautiful and historic landscapes within the District which also merit protection.
FS-Case-325041454	East Devon and Tiverton & Honiton CLPs	option2	· Most of the EDDC area is in an AONB so some development in these is necessary to prevent overdevelopment of some smaller areas.

Ref No	Respondent	Q20	Question 20 Comment
FS-Case-325053097	Ed Persse EIJ Planning Ltd	option3	This needs to be balanced against the need to deliver sufficient housing and infrastructure. Additionally, development outside protected landscapes should be pro actively supported as is the case with Hillcrest at Awliscombe.
FS-Case-325070883	Emma Russell	option2	With the caveat that "small" needs defining. If small means 100 houses I vote for option 1.
FS-Case-325077531	I.G. Cann Exmouth Civic Society	option2	Please see attached submission.
FS-Case-325085151	Matthew Kendrick Grass Roots Planning	option2	See Separate Representations Document
FS-Case-325107229	George Williams Greenslade Taylor Hunt	option2	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325124589	Glynnis Poole LiveWest		Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325131855	Michelle Dobrota-Gibbs N/A	option1	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325156112	Peter Dobbs	option2	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325170882	Dorothy Taylor Exmouth Mental Health St John's Court Carers' Group	option1	Please refer to submitted representations.
FS-Case-325549089	Ken Pearson Stockland Parish Council	option2	urrently the Parish is in an area of 'Open Countryside' with only exception sites allowable, as it is also within the AONB. Our Neighbourhood Plan identifies that 2 houses are required by 2020 and that deadline has now expired. It is extremely difficult to identify sites within the main village as most of it is in a conservation area and most housing is expensive. There are very few, if any, sites available across the area and we are subject to the current Local Plan for EDDC Strategy 27, development in the most sustainable locations because of the few facilities in the Parish, the sensitivity of its environment and landscape, as identified above, within the AONB. This strategy was adopted by EDDC when the village pub was closed for possible development (2016) and has now re-opened again after winning a Planning Appeal (2018) against that development and is set up as a Community Pub and has plans to develop other community facilities. What transpires during a possible post-Covid vaccin
FS-Case-325731054	Andrew Ardley South Western Railway	option3	Taking all factors into account greater levels of development may be the better carbon saving solution by allowing development along sustainable transport corridors, especially railway lines.
FS-Case-325812938	Nick Matthews Savills	option2	See attached.
FS-Case-325819281	Nick Matthews Savills	option2	See attached report.
FS-Case-325829612	Dan Yeates Savilles	option2	Please refer to submitted representation.
FS-Case-325831870	Cem Kosaner Lichfields		N/A
FS-Case-325838141	Dan Yeates Savills	option2	Please refer to submitted representations.